REMARKS

This is in response to the Office Action mailed June 12, 2007. By this Amendment, claims 1, 4-13 and 15-19 are currently in the application.

In the Office Action, the U.S. Patent Office has continued the rejection of the claims over Vogel, et al, Mckeown, Hori, and Takeda. Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration of this rejection, and submits that certain changes have been made to the claims in order to place the claims in better condition for allowance.

Specifically, the limitation of claim 3 have now been incorporated into claim 1. It is submitted that the prior art does not reasonably suggest individually-activated detention devices, where each detention device is designed to lock one of the control levers in an end position in one of the slots in a clamp, where the control lever is only maneuverable in the slot of the locked clamp. Again, in the prior art, such as Mckeown, the maneuvering device is adjusted to lock prior to being used. The adjustment made will position the maneuvering device in a suitable ergonomic position relative to a user. Once the adjustment device is positioned and locked, it can no longer influence the controlling function of the maneuvering device itself. In contrast, the controller of the present invention is fundamentally different as it is normally movable to any position within the range of the lever, or joy stick. Under certain conditions it is desirable to limit the allowable movement of the lever by means of one of the clamps. In this condition, the lever has a limited allowable movement, and the slot of the locked clamp, but it can still be moved to control a controllable object.

Thus, for this as well as the reasons given in the previous amendment of 7 November 2006, it is submitted that claim 1 defines the invention in a manner that is patentably distinct from the prior art, and should be in condition for allowance.

The other claims currently in the application provide further distinguishing features, which should likewise be allowable. Claim 9 and new claims 18 and 19, for example, bring out the electromagnet at an end of the detention arm, opposite from an end with a swivel mount, which, when activated, draws the detention arm into the detention position and against a respective clamp of the console. This is also not shown or suggested in the prior art. The Vogel reference describes an electromagnet 17a with a surface applied against a corresponding surface of a disk 17, however, such electromagnet is intended solely to "freeze" the disk in a certain rotational orientation -- it is not used to draw down a swivel mounted pivot arm against a clamp, where the swivel is at one end of the arm, and the electromagnet is at the other end of the arm.

Thus, for at least the above reasons, it is respectfully submitted that the claims presently in the application patentably define over the cited art, and should be in condition

for allowance. Prompt notice to that effect is respectfully requested. Should the Examiner continue to believe otherwise, the Examiner is kindly requested to contact the undersigned attorney by telephone should the Examiner believe it would result in a furtherance of this matter.

Respectfully submitted,

Christopher H. Hunter
Reg. 34,187
Attorney for Applicant
Parker-Hannifin Corporation
6035 Parkland Boulevard
Cleveland, Ohio 44124-4141
Telephone: (216) 896-2461
Fax: (216)-896-4027
e-mail: chunter@parker.com